

APR 18 2007

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's attention to this Application.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 15-16, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,209,104 to Reza Jalili ("Jalili"), in view of U.S. patent no. 6,720,860 to Chandrasekhar Narayanaswami ("Nara"). Also, the Office Action rejects claims 4-14, 17-20, and 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jilali, in view of Nara and U.S. patent app. pub. no. 2003/0229791 to Eduard De Jong ("Jong").

Applicant respectfully asserts that at least some of the rejections in the Office Action are not well founded. However, in order to minimize additional expenses and delays, this response amends claims 1, 12, 15, and 21 to include additional details, such as language to clarify which components or entities perform which operations. To the extent that the rejections might be applied to the current claims, Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 recites a "method of using a portable computing device to authenticate a user to use an un-trusted computing system to access user data on the portable computing device." Claim 1 specifically recites that some operations are performed by the portable computing device, and others are performed by the un-trusted computing system. For instance, "the portable computing device" (a) generates the "temporary password for controlling access to user data on the portable computing device, and (b) sends the temporary password "to a peripheral device coupled to the portable computing device" to be perceived by the user. However, it is not the portable computing device but the un-trusted computing system that (a) receives a "user-inputted password," and then (b) sends the user-inputted password "from the un-trusted computing system to the portable computing device." The portable computing device then performs additional operations, including (a) determining "whether the user-inputted password matches the temporary password," and (b) "allowing the user to access user data on the portable computing device via the un-trusted computing system in response to" a determination that the temporary password matches the user-inputted password.

The Office Action disregards such important distinctions in the claims pertaining to which entities or components perform which operations. For instance, Jilali involves a client system and a server system, and the Office Action asserts that those systems are the same things as the portable computing device and the un-trusted computing system in claim 1. However, the Office Action is unclear and inconsistent in showing specifically which of the prior art components correspond to which of the claimed components. For instance, the Office Action asserts that Jilali's server system (Figure 3) sends the temporary password to the peripheral device, and the client system (item 806 of Figure 8, lines 19-23 of column 9) receives the user-inputted password. Consequently, the Office Action is equating the portable computing device with the Jilali server and the un-trusted computing system with the Jilali client.

As indicated above, claim 1 also specifically recites that the temporary password is rendered for the user by a peripheral device "coupled to the portable computing device." However, when treating that claim element, the Office Action switches from equating the portable computing device with the Jilali server to equating the portable computing device with the Jilali client. For instance, the Office Action relies on Figure 4 of Jilali, which illustrates a "display device 104" of "client system 100" (lines 41-60 of column 5).

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1. The rejections of the other independent claims have similar shortcomings. The rejections under 35 USC § 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

In addition, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. For example, claim 12, which depends from claim 1, recites that the portable computing device generates "an indicator" and sends the indicator "to the peripheral device" and to "the un-trusted computing system." The indicator is then rendered by the peripheral device and by the un-trusted computing system for perception by the user. Furthermore, a determination is then made, "by the user," whether the indicator rendered by the peripheral device matches the indicator rendered by the un-trusted computing system. The user then

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 18 2007

inputs a password "only when the indicator rendered by the peripheral device matches the indicator rendered by the un-trusted computing system the user desires to use."

The Office Action fails to indicate which part(s) of Jilali allegedly teach sending the indicator to the peripheral device and to the untrusted computing system.

Also, Applicant has seen nothing in Jilali to indicate that a user would determine whether indicators on the peripheral device and on the un-trusted computing system match before entering a password. For at least the foregoing reasons, the Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 12. The rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC § 103(a) should therefore be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 17, 2007

/ Michael R. Barre /
Michael R. Barré
Registration No. 44,023
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
(512) 732-3927

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellecate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Docket No.: 42P16416
Application No.: 10/621,794

11

Utility Patent Application